

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RAYMOND LARRY CARRASCO,

12 Petitioner,

No. CIV S-04-2595 MCE KJM P

13 vs.

14 SCOTT KERNAN,

ORDER

15 Respondent.
16 _____/

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has timely filed a notice of appeal of this
18 court's August 20, 2008 denial of his application for a writ of habeas corpus. Before petitioner
19 can appeal this decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R.
20 App. P. 22(b).

21 A certificate of appealability may issue under 28 U.S.C. § 2253 “only if the applicant has
22 made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The
23 certificate of appealability must “indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy” the requirement.
24 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(3).

25 ///

26 ///

1 A certificate of appealability should be granted for any issue that petitioner can
2 demonstrate is “debatable among jurists of reason,” could be resolved differently by a different
3 court, or is “adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” Jennings v. Woodford,
4 290 F.3d 1006, 1010 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).¹


5 Petitioner has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right in the
6 following issues presented in the instant petition: (1) whether his right to due process was
7 violated by the admission of evidence of prior “bad acts;” (2) whether his right to due process
8 was violated by jury instruction error; (3) whether his conviction violates due process because he
9 was incompetent to stand trial; and (4) whether his right to due process was violated by the trial
10 court’s failure to make a sua sponte determination whether he was competent to stand trial.

11 Petitioner has also filed an application for an extension of time to request a certificate of
12 appealability. In light of this order, petitioner’s request for an extension of time will be denied as
13 unnecessary.

14 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 15 1. A certificate of appealability is issued in the present action; and
16 2. Petitioner’s September 9, 2008 application for an extension of time is denied.

17 Dated: September 25, 2008

18 
19 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24

25 ¹ Except for the requirement that appealable issues be specifically identified, the standard
26 for issuance of a certificate of appealability is the same as the standard that applied to issuance of
a certificate of probable cause. Jennings, at 1010.